



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AD  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,965	04/11/2001	Brent D. Larson	H25210	9717

7590 11/05/2002

Honeywell International Inc.  
Law Dept. AB2  
P O Box 2245  
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUNG T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AC

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/832,965</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Larson</b>
	Examiner <b>Dung Nguyen</b>	Art Unit <b>2871</b>



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 20, 2002
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4)  Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2871

***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment dated 08/20/2002 has been received and entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 12-15 and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Larson, US Patent No. 5,751,388, as stated in the previous office action.

Although claims 1, 17, 19 and 23 are now amended, such amendment are not sufficient to overcome its rejection in the previous Office Action. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., linear polarization orientation) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). It should also be noted that the Larson's quarterwave retarder does have a function of "transmissive" (i.e, light rays pass through such retarder) as well as rotates light polarization between a first polarization orientation and a second polarization (e.g., circularly polarized light). Therefore, the Applicant's transmissive polarization rotating element and the Larson's quarterwave retarder would be the same as well.

Accordingly, the rejection of the above claims stand.

Art Unit: 2871

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 4, 6, 8-11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson, US Patent No. 5,751,388, as stated in the previous office action.

Those above claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 17, 19 and 23, respectively. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Larson's display device.

In addition, regarding claims 6 and 8, as stated in the previous office action, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to form the polarization rotating element in front of the polarized display panel, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70*)

Accordingly, the rejection of those claims stand.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 08/20/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as stated above.

Art Unit: 2871

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0423.

DN  
10/24/2002

  
William L. Sikes  
*Supervisory Patent Examiner*  
*Group 2871*